

THE AMERICAN

A NATIONAL JOURNAL

VOL. XXVIII—No. 709

PHILADELPHIA, SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1898

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE AMERICAN.

A NATIONAL JOURNAL.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY ON EACH SATURDAY.

[Entered at the Post Office at Philadelphia as matter of the second class.]

BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY, PROPRIETORS.
WHARTON BARKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER
BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES,
Rooms 24 and 26
Forrest Building, No. 119 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISING.

Subscription, \$2.00 per annum. Subscribers must notify us when they wish to discontinue.

Advertising rates for short or long time furnished on application.

Specimen copies sent on application.
A copy will be sent free to each advertiser during the continuance of his advertisement.

CHECKS, POSTAL ORDERS, ETC., should be drawn to order of BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY.

*Address through Post Office: THE AMERICAN, Box 1302, Philadelphia.

Address through Post Office: THE AMERICAN, Box 1362, Philadelphia.

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE.

Notes of the Week	PAGE 45
EDITORIALS :	
Mr. Croker's Democracy and the Political Horoscope	150
Railroad Competition, Its Uses and Abuses	151
Yellow Journalism and Stock Exchange Critics	154
Fusion Incompatible with Populism	156
Peoples Party Referendum Ballot	156
BOOK REVIEWS :	
Of Two Patriotisms and Two Policies, Which?	157
A Fighting Parson's Fiction-framed Picture of Washington	159
Tyranny of Grammatical Rules	159
Publications Received	160

CARDINAL TENETS OF THE PEOPLES PARTY.

Creation and Maintenance of an Honest Measure of Values.

Free Coinage of Gold and Silver.

Government Ownership and Operation of Railroad, Telegraph and Telephone Lines.

Opposition to Trusts.

**Opposition to Alien Ownership of Land and Court-made Law.
Recognition of the Right of the People to Rule, i. e., The Initiative and Referendum.**

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

THE United States are unquestionably nearer the brink of war than they have been for a score of years. The shadow of war appears threateningly above the horizon, the black war clouds gather ominously but the chances are that no storm will break, that the darkening war clouds will dissipate before the bright sunshine of common sense and justice that the

American people will bring to bear upon them, that actual war will not follow its threatening shadow that now appears upon the horizon. Our differences with Spain are serious indeed but not such as must be settled by the arbitrament of the sword. True the sovereignty of Spain over the island of Cuba is involved, and until Spain surrenders that sovereignty there can be no settlement of our differences. And true it also is that sovereignty is one of the rights that nations hold sacredly and refuse to even admit the right of other nations to question, a right which if questioned is, in general, yielded only of necessity and after resort to arbitrament of the sword. But Spain's sovereignty over Cuba is of most uncertain tenure. The sovereignty which she holds over Cuba to-day may be gone on the morrow. And so there are reasons to put the question of Spanish sovereignty in Cuba outside of the category of ordinary questions of sovereignty.

If Spain held undisputed sovereignty in Cuba the United States would be the last to question such sovereignty. But such undisputed sovereignty she does not hold. Her sovereignty in Cuba is strenuously and, in a great part of the island, successfully disputed by the Republic of Cuba, and this Republic claims as a right that we should recognize its sovereignty, in short, recognize the independence of Cuba. And such recognition Spain would have no right to resent as a hostile act, for though such recognition would be a denial of her sovereignty, at least for the present, it would be but recognition of that which is a fact.

BUT our duties to our fellow-men, our semi-responsibility for the conduct of affairs in the Western world in accord with the laws of civilization and our interests in the advancement of the peoples of America demand that we do more than recognize the sovereignty of the Republic of Cuba over the island of Cuba. They demand that we not only recognize but demand a recognition of that sovereignty by Spain and the world, a recognition so that the war now being conducted in Cuba, and evidently a fruitless war for Spain, may be stopped, so that the starvation and misery in the island resulting from such war be put an end to, so that the wealth of the now distressed island may be restored, the non-combatant population saved from extermination by famine, and prosperity, happiness and contentment be brought to the people of the unhappy isle.

Intervention on our part to force this recognition is more than justified, it is demanded of us. And this intervention would be no attack on Spanish interests, for the Spanish can derive no profit from pouring troops into Cuba in an effort to regain a sovereignty that all the world sees is lost ; they can derive no profit from continuing the cruel struggle that but results in misery and starvation ; they can derive no profit from exterminating the non-combatant population, from laying the island waste and preventing the return of prosperity, happiness and contentment to the people of the unhappy isle. Indeed the Spanish should welcome our intervention in Cuba that they might extricate themselves from the unfortunate position in which they find themselves without danger or further loss.

Continuance of the struggle is, for Spain, but a fruitless sacrifice. And upon such struggle we cannot look with unconcern for such struggle can only result in keeping that part of the island in which the sovereignty of the Cuban republic is not supreme and into which the Spanish troops penetrate a waste, and in the continued rapid extermination by famine of the non-combatants, the old and those of tender age, the women and the children who are concentrated by cruel military edict, one of the legacies of the Weyler regime, around the towns fortified by the Spanish, and in the midst of these waste districts where they are not provided with the means of sustenance and have not the means for sustaining themselves. Yet this starvation is in the very midst of one of the garden spots of the world, where man has to aid nature but little to garner bountiful food crops. But concentrated around the fortified Spanish towns the non-combatants have not the opportunity to avail of the bountiful gifts with which nature rewards so liberally the least labor exerted in Cuba. They cannot avail of nature's bounty and so save themselves from the horrors of starvation, for they are not provided with the means of cultivating the soil, and the narrow zones they do succeed in cultivating in spite of discouragements no sooner become productive than there is an insurgent raid or Spanish foray, a clash of hostile forces on the very zone of cultivation, such as lays it waste and deprives the miserable non-combatants of the fruits of their labor.

Thus there is misery in Cuba such as has been without parallel in the Christian world since the Spanish gave up their efforts to subjugate the revolted Netherlands three centuries ago. And upon such misery we cannot look unmoved. We cannot look upon the struggle which brings this misery with unconcern, for such misery deeply concerns us, appeals to us in a way that we cannot stand idly by and suffer a continuance of such conditions without coming to despise ourselves as bereft of the first sentiments of humanity. Nor can we look upon the struggle unconcernedly from a material point of view, for from the laying waste of the island we suffer much loss of trade. To protect our mere material interests intervention is demanded.

If, then, President McKinley would firmly demand of Spain in her own interest, in our own interest and in behalf of the Cubans the surrender of Spanish sovereignty over Cuba to the Cuban Republic and the withdrawal of her troops from Cuban soil, he would be heartily supported by the American people without distinction of party. Not only would he be supported by our own people, but he would be applauded by humane men throughout the world, be warmly applauded even in England, where deep humiliation was felt when England abandoned the Armenians to their fate two years ago because interference would have involved her in European war. As to our right and duty to interfere it is the same that any man, seeing his neighbor in the act of murdering his children, would have to invade his neighbor's domicile and prevent such man from carrying out his inhuman purpose, prevent him by reason if possible, by force if necessary. And so it is with the American and Spanish nations. Spain is cruelly putting her children to death in Cuba. When she stepped over the laws of war in her efforts to subjugate the Cubans whom oppression drove to revolt, when she deliberately set about the extermination of non-combatants by starvation, she overstepped her rights, and it became our right and duty to interfere.

That such intervention cannot much longer be postponed and that Spain may take such intervention as an act of war if she so chooses is quite clear. But there is no reason for her to so choose, for such act of intervention would not be an act of unfriendship, would not be a blow at her interests. Instead of resenting and resisting such intervention she should welcome it as offering a way out of her Cuban difficulties. And that Premier Sagasta will so finally accept our intervention which cannot much longer be postponed is probable. If he does there will be

no war. The danger of war lies in an uprising of the Madrid populace as a protest against submission to such intervention and the yielding of the Spanish Government to such protest, which yielding would force war. But if war comes it will grow out of the accident of such uprising and overriding of the judgment of Premier Sagasta, for President McKinley on the one part and Senor Sagasta on the other are determined to maintain peace, determined that there shall be no war if they can prevent.

THE American people do not fear war but they would not welcome it. They would enter into a war with Spain over Cuba with regret, feeling that what was thus submitted to the arbitrament of the sword could well have been settled without war by the exercise of a little forbearance and common sense. And such forbearance there is every reason to suppose the American and Spanish governments will evince unless fear of revolution at home turns the Spanish Government aside.

The sinking of the Maine in Havana harbor is not likely to be the cause of war. Though the battleship may have been wrecked by some outside force, by a mine or torpedo as seems probable and the board of inquiry so reports, war is not likely to follow on that account. Reparation would unquestionably be demanded of Spain for the loss of battleship and of the crew, so far as any reparation is possible, should it be proven that the Maine was blown up by some external force. And this reparation would undoubtedly take the form of a money indemnity. Indeed, what other reparation could be demanded with justice to Spain? If the miscreant responsible for the destruction of the Maine could be found, his execution would promptly be demanded as the first part of the reparation and undoubtedly carried out. But such discovery is highly improbable and so, assuming that the Maine was destroyed by outside forces, the only reparation that Spain can make for the destruction of the Maine in Havana harbor, where she was under Spanish protection, is payment of a sum of money to cover the loss of the battleship and as indemnity to be paid to those nearest of kin to those who were killed by the blowing up of the Maine. And if it is proven that the battleship was blown up in Havana harbor by a mine or torpedo and money reparation demanded, Spain will doubtless make this reparation as promptly as a bankrupted nation can and with such reparation made the sinking of the Maine would, as an international question, disappear.

It is indeed urged that no money payment should be accepted as reparation for the destruction of the Maine, that the making of Cuba free would be the only proper reparation. But the blowing up of the Maine in Havana harbor by some Spanish miscreant, supposing it was so blown up, gives no ground upon which to make a demand upon Spain for the complete surrender of her sovereignty over Cuba. There is ground enough for the making of such demand, and that ground is the starvation every day of as many human beings as met their death in the destruction of the Maine, but that destruction does not in itself make valid ground for such demand. It would indeed be an effective tribute if, upon the monument that will some day be reared over the graves of the Maine's unknown, could be written the epitaph, "They died that Cuba might be free;" but it is not upon the destruction of the Maine that we can rest our demand upon Spain for the recognition of the Cuban Republic and the surrender to that Republic of her sovereignty over Cuba.

THE dissolution of the Spanish Cortes preparatory to the election of a new is looked upon by many in the United States as planting possible seeds of trouble. Thus it is suggested that the Liberal and Conservative parties in Spain will go before the people on the issue of war and peace, the Conservatives demanding war with the United States. And then it is said that if the Conservatives won war would be inevitable. But those who

harbor these fears may calm themselves. The Conservatives are not going to win the elections which come off about the middle of April, the new Cortes being called to meet on April 26th. The defeat of the Conservatives and success of the Liberals is already agreed upon. In the Cortes just dissolved the Conservatives were in an overwhelming majority. In the Cortes to be elected there will be an overwhelming Liberal majority. This was arranged some time since by Premier Sagasta, and elections turn out in Spain just as the Premier desires.

There is indeed, in Spain, supposed to be universal suffrage. But it is universal only in name. The electorate does not in effect select the members of the Cortes. The elections are a mere farce, the Prime Minister allotting the seats to the different parties and filling the seats he allots to his own party with such men as he sees fit. And in the present case Sagasta has allotted 300 seats to the Government, 70 to the Conservatives and 50 to the Carlists and Republicans at which allotment Senor Robledo, leader of the Conservatives, complained bitterly as making too revolutionary a change in the Conservative representation. But no other course is open to him than to make the best of this small allotment, for under the electoral methods pursued there is nothing to be gained by appeals to the Spanish electorate or by denouncing the whole electoral system as a sham and inaugurating, if possible, a movement that would be revolutionary. And so often has he profited under the sham system that he probably would not think for an instant of denouncing it as a sham.

Premier Sagasta, practically appointing his own Cortes, will secure a Cortes to his own liking beyond a doubt. Of this we need have no fear. The wonder about this sham electoral system is that a Prime Minister once inducted into office ever vacates it and turns over the Cortes to his opponents. But there come times in Spain when popular upheaval can be quieted by the fall of a Ministry and change in the political complexion of the Cortes, and then such fall comes. Thus it was with Senor Canovas' rule as Premier for a quarter of a century. He vacated the Premiership and permitted Sagasta to take his place when revolutionary storms gathered, thus quieting such storms and then, the storms passed, reassuming the Premiership, which he held at the time of his assassination some months since, which tragedy was followed, after a brief interval, by raising Senor Sagasta to the Premiership.

SINCE the news of the destruction of the Maine startled the country, indeed since the DeLome incident, Congress has acted with great circumspection. It is an illustration of the oft noted fact that responsibility makes radicals conservatives. Thus it has been with the great number of congressmen who were urgent for radical action in Cuban matters before our relations with Spain became acutely critical. With one or two exceptions, notably Senators Mason and Allen, all those who were foremost in pressing for the taking of radical action in behalf of the Cubans have, for the time being, dropped the subject, not wishing to complicate matters in any way. And so, putting trust in the President, Congress has applied itself industriously to other matters than those that have secured almost a monopoly of public attention during the past two weeks, only evidencing its acute feeling upon the Cuban question by the promptness and practical unanimity with which the Senate passed a bill to authorize the enlistment of two additional artillery regiments to man the new coast defenses; by the readiness with which the House conferees upon the Fortifications Appropriation bill accepted the Senate amendments which more than doubled the appropriations as authorized by the bill as it passed the House; by the disgust and adverse comments directed at Mr. Boutelle, Chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, upon his hesitation to respond promptly to the request of the Navy Department to authorize the enlisting of 1,500 additional marines and sailors to man the men-of-war now out of commission by reporting a bill authorizing such

enlistment, and by the criticism directed at Mr. Reed for refusing, as Chairman of the Committee on Rules, to report a special rule for the consideration of the bill authorizing the enlistment of two additional artillery regiments.

Few have been the long sessions of Congress during which the House has so persistently kept at work on the appropriation bills as has the present House. As a result the appropriation bills are further advanced than they have been at the corresponding date of any long session of Congress for more than twenty-five years. Of the fourteen regular appropriation bills ten have already passed the House, and one, the Rivers and Harbors bill, under which some \$20,000,000 are usually appropriated for the improvement of rivers and harbors, the leaders of the House have, for reasons of economy, or rather political effect on the elections of this fall, decided not to pass at all at this session. Thus but three general appropriation bills remain for the House to pass upon.

The Rivers and Harbors bill, which is a very popular bill with the majority of Congressmen, carrying as it does appropriations to be spent in many Congressional districts, is not to be killed altogether. The purpose of the leaders is simply to postpone its consideration until the short session of Congress, during which session there is ordinarily no Rivers and Harbors bill discussed, it being the practice for each Congress to pass but one of these bills and pass it at the long session. In this way the appropriations made at the long session of Congress will be kept down by \$20,000,000 or so, and thus the Republicans enabled to show a record for economy in appropriations that is entirely fictitious, but by which record they hope to make political capital during the coming campaign. Of course, if they take up and pass a Rivers and Harbors bill at the short session of Congress the appropriations for that session will sum up unusually large, but this session of Congress comes just after and not just before the Congressional elections and therefore an unfavorable showing, an apparent showing of extravagance at the short session is not feared so much as a favorable showing, and apparent showing of economy is desired at the long or present session. This trifling with appropriation bills for political effect is a petty business.

Of course, the postponing of the Rivers and Harbors bill is put on the ground of necessary economy. Revenues during the present fiscal year are, if we leave out the receipts from the Pacific Railroad sales, sure to fall far short of expenditures, but next year the Dingley bill will be in full working order and yield, we are told, ample revenues to meet the expenses of the government. So it is plausibly argued that the government will be in better position to pay out money for the improvement of rivers and harbors a year hence than it is to-day, and that it is therefore wise to put off the passage of the Rivers and Harbors bill until the short session of next year. But the fact is that the government is in no way short of money to-day. Aside from the gold reserve of \$100,000,000 the government held on February 28th, last, \$125,000,000, which was a larger balance than it held a year before, for though there has been a large deficit in ordinary receipts as compared to expenditures, there has been, with the sums realized from the sales of the Pacific roads added into receipts, a very considerable surplus of receipts, a larger surplus than there is likely to be a year hence, and, therefore, the excuse offered for putting off the Rivers and Harbors bill to the short session is no excuse at all.

THE disposal of the tariff and revenue question during the special session of Congress, thus relieving the first regular session of much work that would have otherwise fallen to it is, of course, one reason for the great progress made with the appropriation bills. It is now thought that the House will have finished them all by the middle of March, that the Senate will be through with them by the first of May, and that Congress will be ready to

adjourn early in May, unless war should break out in the interim, when there would be much legislation required of Congress. But aside from the disposal of the tariff question at the special session, the great reason for the dispatch which has been made with the appropriation bills has been the barrenness of the present session and the small amount of time given to the consideration of general legislation. There has come before Congress but one matter of prime importance, the Hawaiian annexation treaty, and that has been confined to the Senate. Before the House there have come but two measures of general importance, and there is prospect of one more measure of importance coming up in the near future. These measures are the bankruptcy bill, the Loud Postal bill, and the restrictive immigration bill, all of which have been before the House before and discussed, and all of them passed in one shape or another by previous Congresses.

The bankruptcy and immigration bills are both Senate bills, though the House discarded the whole of the Senate bankruptcy bill and substituted one of its own. So it is that though Senate and House have both passed bankruptcy bills they voted on bills of widely different scope. Yet by nominally passing the Senate bill with amendments, the amendments being the striking out of everything after the enacting clause and the substitution of an entire new bill framed by the House Committee, the House passes a bill well advanced on the road to enactment, for the Senate, disagreeing to the House amendments, or rather bill, and standing by its own bill, both bills now go before a joint conference committee. What this conference committee will evolve, if it succeeds in evolving anything, remains to be seen. It has a wide scope for its labors, for there are points in the Senate bill as it passed the Senate, and as amended it passed the House, that are widely at variance.

The immigration bill as reported to the House is much akin to the bill as it passed the Senate, and unless loaded down with some amendment by the House will probably pass and be enacted into law.

WHEN a state legislature fails to elect a United States Senator because the vote is divided among three or more candidates no one of whom can command a majority of the votes cast, it is to be presumed that the majority of the legislature prefer no elector and a vacant seat in the United States Senate to the filling of the seat with any one of the candidates. And if a state thus prefers to go without its full representation in the United States Senate rather than to exalt to the high office any one of the candidates, the loss of representation on the floor of the United States Senate is its own lookout. If a state legislature deliberately chooses to sacrifice such representation as the least of two evils, its sacrifice should be observed by the United States Senate which should not permit the governor of the state to break such sacrifice, deliberately chosen as the least of two evils, by appointing some man to the seat in the Senate who was a candidate before the legislature but whose exaltation to the Senatorship the majority of the legislature deliberately declared would be a greater evil to the state than the loss of representation in the United States Senate. For the United States Senate to seat such a man would be a wrong, a disregard of the wishes of the legislature of the sovereign state. And so has the United States Senate held.

If the governor should appoint as Senator some man who was not a candidate, who received no vote at the hands of the legislature at all, it does not change the case at all, for it must be presumed that the majority of the legislature did not deem such man worthy of election to the Senatorship. This will be perfectly clear if we keep in mind a possible case. Thus, suppose there is a state in which three parties, Republicans, Democrats and Populists are equally strong; that at a general election each secure one-third of the members of the legislature; that the Republican candidate for Governor wins out by the slimmest of

votes. Now this legislature comes to elect a Senator and fails, for Republicans and Democrats feel that the state would be better represented by a vacant chair in the Senate than by a Populist; because Republicans and Populists would rather have no Senator than a Democratic Senator, and because Populists and Democrats regard the selection of a Republican as worse than no selection. So it appears that two-thirds of the legislature, representing two-thirds of the people of the state, would rather have no Senator than a Populist Senator, or Democratic Senator, or Republican Senator. As a result, the legislature fails to elect and adjourns. And then the Republican Governor picks out a Republican who was not voted for by the legislature and appoints him Senator, clearly in contravention of the wishes of two-thirds of the legislature and people of the state. And on this ground the United States Senate refuses to seat him, holding that when the legislature fails to elect it must have a reason sufficient to itself, and that the Governor has no right to appoint and thereby ignore that reason. This was the rule established by the Senate in the Lee-Mantle case.

NOW LET US go a step further. Suppose a legislature made up equally of Republicans, Democrats and Populists cannot effect an organization because no candidate for Speaker can command more than the vote of his own party and that the term for the meeting of the legislature expires before an organization is effected. Never organizing, such legislature cannot ballot for Senator. And then the Governor steps in and appoints. Now, is such an appointment on any different plane than an appointment when the legislature effects organization but fails to choose a Senator? Obviously it is not; it is on just the same plane, and so evidently thought Senators when they turned down the claim of Mr. Corbett, of Oregon, resting on such an appointment as this, an appointment by the Governor when the legislature failed to organize, by the decisive vote of 50 to 19.

Now all this seems fair enough, but there is something radically wrong about a system that works smoothly enough where there are only two parties but breaks down and deprives a State of representation where there are three. The only way out is to give the plurality party the Senatorship whether it happens to be the majority party or not, and this can only be satisfactorily accomplished by putting an end to the selection of Senators by State legislatures and causing them to be chosen by the direct vote of the people in the same manner as are members of the House of Representatives.

WITH Congress following out a program leading to an adjournment early in May and Mr. Walker's Committee on Banking and Currency still making no progress so far as known in the direction of building a general currency plan upon which the Republican members of the Committee can agree preparatory to submitting it to the House, even the chronic currency reformers had about given up looking for anything to emanate from this Committee or be accomplished by the present Congress in the direction of retiring the national currency and substituting bank notes. But now comes Mr. H. H. Hanna, of Indianapolis, who has undertaken the task of working up the business men of the country in support of greenback retirement and the substitution of bank notes, who worked up, called and created the Business Men's Monetary Convention that met in Indianapolis in January a year ago and was reassembled in Indianapolis last January. He bids his compatriots to have hope and keep up courage, declares his confidence that legislation along the lines laid down by the monetary commission, that was his creation, is not far distant. To all appearances the plan of this monetary commission was received coldly by Congress, ignored and nonchalantly put in a pigeon hole for a future reference only to be permitted to mould away in oblivion. But there is nothing like perseverance, and of perseverance Mr. H. H. Hanna has an ample fund. Just how

drastic legislation along the lines laid down by the Indianapolis Monetary Convention he looks for he does not tell. But the surprising thing is that he should expect any legislation of this kind at all.

WHEN the Indian Government recently agreed to receive deposits of gold in London and issue telegraphic orders against such deposits for rupee certificates in Calcutta, it was generally assumed, indeed it was specifically stated, that such rupee certificates would be redeemable in gold at the rate of 16 pence for one rupee. And this was everywhere heralded as a step towards the adoption of the gold standard in India. Now such adoption of the gold standard may be contemplated but the order directing the acceptance of gold sovereigns in London on behalf of the Indian Government and the issue of telegraphic or other drafts on the Indian Government at the rate of $16\frac{1}{8}$ pence per rupee was not a step in this direction. Provision was made in India to meet such drafts by the issue of rupee certificates that serve all the purposes of money in Calcutta. But the Indian Government did not undertake to hold gold against such certificates and redeem them in gold. It agreed to pay the drafts sold in London for gold in certificates payable in silver rupees, in silver certificates not gold certificates. So when the Indian Government undertook to take gold on deposit in London, it took no departure in policy. It simply extended to London and agreed to do at London what it agreed to do at Calcutta when the mints were closed to silver.

When the mints were closed to free silver coinage in 1893 the Indian Government agreed to give silver rupees at the Calcutta mint in exchange for gold there deposited at the rate of 15 rupees for £1, or 1 rupee for 16 pence. And now the Indian Government agrees to give silver rupees or silver certificates in Calcutta for gold deposited in London, not at the rate of 1 rupee for 16 pence, but 1 rupee for $16\frac{1}{8}$ pence of gold deposited. This extra $\frac{1}{8}$ of a penny exacted represents the cost of shipping gold to India, and when the Indian Government agreed to take gold on deposit in London and so saved this cost to those depositing gold in London but who would otherwise have had to have shipped the gold to India the Indian Government resolved to keep for itself what it saved and not give such saving to the depositor of the gold.

THE Indiana Populists held their state convention last week and after a stormy meeting turned down fusion, resolved that the Peoples party could only fill its mission by taking an independent course, unseated the one member of the Peoples Party National Committee from Indiana who held that the Peoples party could best serve the ends of Populism, do greatest service to the people by sinking its individuality in the Democratic party and disappearing as a party and elected in his place a true Populist who believes that the Peoples party has a mission that it can only fill by living, that to look to the Democratic party to carry out such mission is folly and that to surrender to the Democratic party would be a fatal blunder. So as a result of this convention Indiana's three representatives on the National Committee of the Peoples party, are now all opposed to fusion with the Democratic party and in spite of the stormy sessions of the convention which was the largest ever held in Indiana, 800 delegates being present, the convention adjourned with harmony restored and new life, and courage, and hope instilled into the ranks of Indiana Populists. This action of the Populists of Indiana and the set back that Mr. Butler recently suffered in Minnesota, a stronghold of fusion, go to show that the strength of fusion is waning and that soon the strength of the fusionists in the organization of the Peoples party will be cut down proportionately to the strength of the fusionists among the rank and file of the party, to an insignificant minority without weight or influence in the party councils.

PHILADELPHIA seems to be fast in the toils of the corruptionist, at the mercy of speculators, whom success in one direction has emboldened to aim at the exploitation of the public in others. A gas company has only recently gotten a lease of the city gas works, and now a water company is aiming to get control of the city's water supply. A few weeks ago attention was directed to the city's water supply by the outbreak of a typhoid epidemic of no inconsiderable proportions. And the presence of typhoid fever in an epidemic form is a disgrace to any city. Typhoid should be as rare in our cities as cholera. Its presence can be guarded against; our cities should be as free from it as they are from cholera.

Typhoid is a preventable disease just as cholera is, and being preventable it should be prevented. The germ of typhoid fever is not air born and the disease is in no sense infectious. To contract the disease the poison of typhoid must be swallowed, and typhoid only becomes epidemic in a city when that city is supplied by water polluted by the excrement of some typhoid patient. And such pollution can be guarded against. It can be guarded against by watching over the sources of the water supply, or if naturally pure water is unobtainable, the polluted water can be purified by filtering. In 1892, cholera raged in Hamburg with great virulence. It turned the attention of the citizens to the water supply of the town, which was one of the worst in Europe. The result was the building of a filtering plant. The source of the water supply was not changed, but the water was purified before being delivered to the city. The result has been striking. The death rate in Hamburg has fallen from twenty-four in the thousand, as the average in the years before the establishment of the filter, to sixteen. And this any city can do. No city need have impure water, for the foulest of water can be filtered and purified and at no great cost. The sewerage of Paris is treated by filter beds with such success that the water that runs from the sewerage beds is five times as pure as the water in the river Seine. Thus Paris could drink its own filtered sewerage with greater safety than the water of the Seine.

Now the typhoid epidemic in Philadelphia directed attention to the water supply. A filter bed could be built at the expense of \$5,000,000 and the city supplied with pure water, the city death rate reduced by one-quarter or more, three or four thousand lives saved every year, and all at the cost of \$150,000 a year as interest and perhaps as much more to manage the filter bed. Failure to expend such sum is causing the sacrifice of three or four thousand lives a year. In not spending such money we hold it not worth while to spend a hundred dollars to save a human life.

Last November the people of Philadelphia voted in favor of a loan, part of which was to be used for the bettering of the water supply, but the City Council refuses, under some influence, to carry out the popular will. And that influence is a corporate water octopus which has come on the scene with a proposition to establish filter beds and supply the city with pure water for something like \$1,150,000 a year or four times what the city could render the same service to itself. Yet Councils hastens to vote this water ordinance, hastens as it did to vote the lease of the city gas works. Let us have pure water but let us not submit to robbery to get it.

"ALTHOUGH gold, in the fifties, declined in value but little as compared to silver, there is no doubt that at that time both gold and silver, *which were then bound together by French bimetallism*, declined in purchasing power considerably as compared with commodities, and . . . there was therefore a rise of prices." —A remarkable statement for Mr. R. E. Preston, late Director of the United States Mint. [XXV Annual Report of the Director of the Mint, p. 120.]

MR. CROKER'S DEMOCRACY AND THE POLITICAL HOROSCOPE.

TWO weeks since Mr. Butler, at Minneapolis, proclaimed opposition to trusts to be his shibboleth. Last week, in New York, Mr. Croker declared with emphasis that opposition to trusts, not free silver coinage, should be the rallying cry of the Democracy. Thus we have Mr. Butler and Mr. Croker sounding the same watchword but with a widely different meaning. We have Mr. Butler declaring that opposition to trusts means free silver coinage, means the issue of all paper money by the government and in a volume sufficient to meet the demands of trade, means government ownership of railroads, means government ownership of our telegraph and telephone systems. But to this meaning Mr. Croker is far from subscribing. In fact he does not subscribe to any part of the doctrine of opposition to trusts as laid down by Mr. Butler. Yet we have him calling upon Democrats to take opposition to trusts as their rallying cry, as a platform upon which all Democrats, gold Democrats and silver Democrats, can harmonize. What Mr. Croker means by opposition to trusts he does not make apparent other than that he regards it as a good cry to get in on. Indeed it is doubtful if he attaches any other meaning to opposition to trusts. As the *New York Times* sums it up: "Anti-monopoly may be a good enough war cry until after election." And so evidently Mr. Croker regards it.

Thus the *Times* makes light of Mr. Croker and his war cry. Yet, and this is significant, this paper, leading mouthpiece of the gold Democrats, proclaims its readiness to take up this war cry if the Democratic party will make it its own. The *Times* regards Mr. Croker's opposition to trusts as arrant demagoguery, as doubtless it is, but this demagoguery, while ridiculing, it is ready to take up in order to achieve a union of Democrats in 1900 and Democratic success. Indeed there is no reason to doubt that the gold Democrats would, with hardly an exception, rally around such a war cry as Mr. Croker proposes to raise.

The question of restoring harmony in the Democratic machine depends upon Mr. Croker's ability to draw the silver Democrats away from the war cry, sixteen to one, as impolitic, and around the pliable shibboleth of opposition to trusts, a shibboleth so pliable that Senator Butler may proclaim it on the one hand and Mr. Croker on the other. Yet Mr. Croker's Democracy and Senator Butler's Populism are as far apart as the two poles, and that Mr. Butler would support Mr. Croker's Democracy, even under the beguiling war cry of opposition to trusts, is hardly conceivable. But then Mr. Croker does not hope to draw Populists into the Democratic party. His expectation is that they will be driven away, his aim to unite the gold and silver Democrats, unite them rather by bringing the silver Democrats back to subservience to the moneyed oligarchy, back to the faith of the gold Democrats, than by bringing the gold Democrats back into the party. Indeed, the gold Democrats are now the outcasts from their party, but Mr. Croker's aim is to bring the party to them, rather than them to the party. And of his ability to succeed in this he has every confidence, not a feigned confidence, but a real confidence, as we have reason to know. This confidence he shows by his proposition now made to the silver Democrats that all Democrats, of whatever faction, shall now agree to abide by the decision of the national convention in 1900, whatever that decision may be; that he and Tammany and the Democracy of New York will agree to abide by the decision of that convention if it is against gold, provided the silver Democrats will agree to abide by the decision of the convention if it shelves the silver question and pushes another war cry to the fore.

Thus Mr. Croker works for harmony. Without that harmony, without the bridging of the chasm which separates gold and silver Democrats, not the silver Democrats who supported

Bryan and the gold Democrats who supported Palmer, but the gold Democrats who voted for Mr. McKinley, he feels that Democratic success is impossible. Of course, the compromising and backsliding of the silver Democrats that must be done to bridge the chasm must drive the Populists who supported Mr. Bryan and voted the Democratic ticket in 1896 out of that party. But the great majority of such Populists are lost to the Democratic party anyhow. The faith or rather hope that many had in the Democratic party in 1896, the hope that it would throw over its corrupt practices, turn over a new leaf and, spurning the temptations held out by the moneyed oligarchy, assail that oligarchy without quarter has been lost; where there was hope in that party there is now, among Populists, a feeling of disgust and distrust and a determination to cut loose for once and all from the party that promises to resist the aggressions of the moneyed oligarchy, but leads in the direction of subserviency to that oligarchy, a direction which Mr. Croker is doing all in his power to give to it.

So continued support of the Democratic party is not to be looked for from Populists whether the Democratic party stands by free silver coinage and in a half-hearted way opposes the aggressions of the moneyed oligarchy made through the agency of the appreciating gold standard while tolerating the aggressions of this same oligarchy made through the abuse of our transportation system or turns its back on silver and raises the war cry offered by Mr. Croker, a war cry to be used before election and forgotten after. And without the support of these Populists—there were two millions of them who voted the Democratic ticket in 1896—the Democratic party must remain a hopelessly minority party unless it can draw back to itself the gold Democrats who voted for Mr. McKinley in 1896.

That there are enough of these Democrats to make up the loss of two million Populists is not at all impossible. Just what number of gold Democrats voted for Mr. McKinley in 1896 it is, of course, impossible to tell. But that they gave to Mr. McKinley no inconsiderable part of his vote is certain. To begin with, the Republicans polled a much larger vote than they ever polled before, an increase in vote not to be explained by the natural increase of population or the remarkably full vote brought out by the contest, a vote so full in some of the states that the Republicans had to carry to win as to throw a grave doubt upon the accuracy of the returns. But granting that the Republican vote was padded in the states of West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky and Iowa, states that showed an abnormally large vote, and a vote that looks suspiciously large alongside the vote cast in neighboring states—padded in these states by from two to three hundred thousand votes, which seems not improbable, and considering the increase of Republican vote that may rightly be attributed to the natural increase of population and the extraordinary interest of the campaign that brought out many usually stay-at-home voters, it is still clear that the Republicans gained more votes from outside parties than they lost to outside parties. And when the very considerable Republican revolt is borne in mind, when it is borne in mind that a million and a half is considered a conservative figure at which to place the number of former Republicans who severed party ties to vote for Mr. Bryan the size of the Democratic bolt at once becomes apparent, for it is evident that the gap made in the Republican lines by the silver Republican bolt was more than filled by recruits gathered from other parties. And as there were very few Populists who voted for Mr. McKinley it is evident that this gap must have been filled by gold Democrats, that of these Democrats there must have been close to two millions, if not more.

Therefore, if the silver Democrats could be held together round the shibboleth of anti-monopoly, if they could be induced to drop the battle cry of free silver as a body, cease to be silver Democrats and join hands with the gold Democrats as anti-monopoly Democrats, the gold Democrats who supported Mr. McKinley being brought back into the party on this basis, it is

clear that the place in the Democratic ranks filled, in 1896, by two millions of Populists who will not be found there again might be taken by the gold Democrats who were found in the Republican ranks in 1896. Thus the Republican party would be much weakened and weakened proportionately more than the Democratic party, even admitting, as we must, that the silver Republicans who joined the Democratic party in 1896, would leave it under such circumstances, almost to a man.

No great number of these Republicans who left the Republican party when it was made clear at the St. Louis convention and during the following campaign that thenceforth that party would do the bidding of the moneyed oligarchy would return to the Republic party, wedded more firmly than ever, as it surely will be in 1900, to the teachings of Mammon. So what would remain for these Republicans to do? They would have to flock by themselves as a hopeless minority party or line up with the Peoples party. What they will do if the Peoples party moves energetically to the fore in 1898 and shows itself as a self-confident, aggressive organization can scarcely be doubted. The sympathies of these ex-Republicans are now largely with the Peoples party, for the Peoples party is the party of equality, stands where the Republican party of Lincoln stood. In short, these ex-Republicans are in much closer agreement with the principles of the Peoples party than the principles enunciated by the Democratic party at Chicago. They give their support to this Democratic party in preference to the Peoples party almost wholly for political reasons. They believe that by joining forces with the Democratic party they can win, which they cannot; that, through the success of the Democratic party, they can accomplish some of the ends at which they aim, at least one of the ends, restoration of free silver coinage; that to join hands with the Peoples party would be to throw their strength away and so result in the defeat of all their aims. And so they support the Democratic party although the Peoples party better represents their views, strives for the achievement of more, indeed, all of their aims.

So if the Democratic party should put the silver shibboleth aside and take up the war cry of anti-monopoly proffered by Mr. Croker, a war cry that when proffered by him means nothing more than a good enough war cry until after election, there can be no doubt where the million and a half of silver Republicans, who voted for Mr. Bryan, would go. Into the Peoples party they will go under such circumstances if that party shows a capacity for successful leadership, and that capacity we are sure it will show long before 1900.

Such rearrangement of party lines, the drawing away of two million gold Democrats from the Republican party, their return to the Democratic party as an anti-monopoly party, a party of spoils and without principle, and the drawing away from the Democratic party of two million Populists and a million and a half of silver Republicans would leave the Republican party and the Croker Democracy with about a parity of strength, leave each with about five million votes. But that the three million of silver Democrats, the majority of whom are earnest advocates of silver remonetization and determined opponents of the moneyed oligarchy though they have not grasped the full scope of the plans of this oligarchy, and many of whom are already more nearly Populists than Chicago platform Democrats, would go with their party, as a body, if it appeared as the Croker Democracy, a party of spoils and without principle, is not conceivable. Many no doubt are spoilsmen and ready to put party before principle, and it cannot be doubted that those who fought earnestly for gold prior to the Chicago convention but became sudden converts to bimetallism after would, for the most part, be glad to see the Croker program carried out, and the Democratic party surrender principle for the hope of harmony and the promise of success. But the majority would no doubt be disgusted at such action, and a good part

break party ties to join some party standing for principle and not for spoils. And finding that party in the Peoples party they would join it, and thus the Peoples party would become number two instead of number three, soon to become number one through accretions from the Republican party, accretions that are sure to be made with great constancy as the Republican party is shown up as the defender of the moneyed oligarchy and the Peoples party shown to be the defender of human rights, of the equality of man, of Republican institutions, and thus would the way open to the triumph of the Peoples party in 1900, a triumph over those who would exalt money above man, who would build up a moneyed oligarchy upon the ruins of our Republic, a triumph of the people over the forces of corruption and the power of money, over Croker Democracy and Hanna Republicanism.

RAILROAD COMPETITION, ITS USES AND ABUSES.

COMPETITION is injurious for it breeds monopoly. Such was the keynote struck before the Supreme Court last week by the railroad attorneys arguing the legality of the Joint Traffic Association. This association comprises the great trunk lines of railroad running to the seaboard from Chicago and other central points in the middle west from which radiate railroads sapping the agricultural west and acting as feeders to the trunk lines, so named because the major portion of their grain business is gathered and delivered to them for forwarding by other lines. In short, the trunk lines forward grain from central points in the west, into which it is gathered by lines of road radiating through the agricultural country and known as "grangers," to points on the seaboard. They fill a sort of intermediate position, transporting grain from points of accumulation to points of distribution. The roads that do this business, occupy this position, are the roads that are parties to the Joint Traffic Association which the government has brought suit to have declared illegal as an association organized in contravention of both the Inter-state Commerce Law and the Sherman Anti-trust Law of 1890. It is this suit that is now pending before the Supreme Court and that was argued last week by the government advocate chosen by the Attorney General and by an eminent array of legal talent on behalf of the railroads.

A little less than a year ago the Supreme Court rendered a decision declaring a kindred association, the Trans-Missouri Freight Association, to be illegal as an association in restraint of trade and enjoined the railroads from operating under such association. The government asks what amounts to a reaffirmation of this decision in the pending case, asks to have the Joint Traffic Association declared illegal and the trunk lines enjoined from operating under it. For the Supreme Court to rule otherwise would be to overturn the precedent established in the Trans-Missouri case, which ex-Senator Edmunds, one of the attorneys of the railroads, suggested the Court could do with great propriety.

This Joint Traffic Association partakes of the nature of a great railroad trust. It was organized to put an end to competition and hold up rates. It is an attempt to establish a pool in fact but not in name, to secure to the railroads the practical ends of pooling and still keep within the letter of the Interstate Commerce law which prohibits pooling. It is an effort to restrain competition and still keep within the letter of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law which interdicts the making of agreements in restraint of trade. In short it is an effort to beat around both Interstate Commerce law and Anti-Trust law, to break both laws in spirit yet not in letter.

Of course the attorneys of the railroads did not admit this. They admitted that the Joint Traffic Association was organized

to and does restrain competition but argued that though the association is a restraint to competition it is not a restraint to trade but quite the reverse, that by restraining competition it is calculated to promote trade and therefore not contravene but advance the purposes of those who framed the two laws under which it is now sought to have this association declared illegal.

Unrestrained railroad competition, it was argued, leads to the wiping out of the weaker competitors and the survival of the stronger, hence the concentration of the competing roads under one head and therefore the creation of railroad monopoly. This is put forth as an excuse for the creation of a railroad monopoly at once. If unrestrained competition must lead, in the end, to the creation of monopoly it would be well, so it is argued, to create such monopoly at once. If the community must suffer from the evils of monopoly, pay the exactions of monopoly in the end, it would be better for it to commence to suffer those evils, pay those exactions at once, for thereby the security holders in the weaker railroads that, it is said, must be wrecked by unrestrained competition, would be protected and permitted to share in the exactions of monopoly along with the security holders of the stronger roads. But granting all this, we fancy the users of the railroads would be inclined to put off the exactions of monopoly as long as possible, to postpone the day when they must be crushed as long as may be. This is human nature.

True, it is said that a railroad monopoly created by paper agreement would not be so oppressive as a monopoly created by the wrecking of the weaker roads and their absorption by the stronger, that the preservation of the weaker would be a preventive to the exaction of excessive monopoly charges as the exaction of such charges would be a temptation to the weaker roads allotted but a small percentage of the gains of such exactions, a percentage proportionate to their weakness, to break away from their paper agreements and secretly cut rates in an effort to swell their profits by securing more than the share of traffic allotted to them under the monopoly creating agreements known as pools. And this, it is said, would act as a check to the charging of excessive rates, a check that would not be present if the weaker roads were not preserved as independent lines, but crushed out and absorbed by the stronger. So, it is argued, a railroad monopoly created by agreement would be much less burdensome, because less iron bound than a monopoly built up by unrestrained competition, the wreckage and then the absorption of the weaker by the stronger roads.

So on this ground may be defended such a monopoly as it is the aim of the Joint Traffic Association to create. On this ground it may be urged with some plausibleness that this association does not restrain, but promotes trade; that by creating a monopoly by agreement it prevents the creation of a worse monopoly by the pressure of competition, and is, therefore, not in contravention of the Interstate Commerce and Anti-trust laws either in law or spirit, for, it was argued, it is not to be supposed that the framers of such acts intended to interdict compacts between railroads which are promotive of the purposes of such acts.

Whatever force there may be in this line of argument in defense of the creation of railroad monopolies by agreement may be fairly cited as argument in favor of government ownership of our railroads, for surely if there must be railroad monopoly, national monopoly is preferable to private monopoly, so that the profits of monopoly may be divided among the many and not reserved to the few, or, what is the same thing, so that exactions of monopoly may be guarded against and the making of excessive charges prevented by removing the temptation, a temptation irrepressible and irresistible where such exactions result in private gain. True, this is an argument that cannot weigh with the court, but with the public it must weigh.

The defence of the Joint Traffic Association was, however,

not rested upon this ground of railroad monopoly. It was not upon the argument that unrestrained railroad competition must lead to railroad monopoly, that the Joint Traffic Association operates to hinder the creation of such monopoly and is, therefore, not to be regarded as an association in restraint of trade that the defenders of this association, before the Supreme Court, layed greatest stress. It was on the ground that unrestrained railroad competition leads inevitably to the creation of private monopoly, to the gathering of the shipping business into a few hands, to the upbuilding of industrial monopoly, and that the Joint Traffic Association by restraining this competition does, in effect, operate to prevent the growth of monopoly, to give all men a fair opportunity, that the court was appealed to most warmly to affirm the legality of this association, an association organized to restrain competition it was admitted, but in effect promoting trade.

With the trunk lines competing with one another a cutting of rates and constant discrimination in favor of the larger shippers must be, it was argued, unpreventable. Thus, it was urged, the large shippers could and would, under free competition, play one road off against the others and so secure concessions in rates. With the large shipper threatening to ship by another road unless granted a rebate by one that has had part of his business and with which he is dickering for a lower rate, the roads cannot, under free competition, maintain their published rates. They will give rebates to the larger shippers. If they will not grant the rebate on the threat, they will upon the loss of the traffic. It may be that the shipper cannot get the reduced rate he demands of the road that has been serving him from the road by which he threatens to ship his freight. But if he turns his freight over such road to the exclusion of the others those others will suffer a falling off in freights and, of course, in net earnings, not only proportionately to the loss of traffic and gross earnings but much more, for a light train costs almost as much to run as a heavy train, and so expenses do not fall in like ratio with gross earnings, and net earnings fall more than gross earnings from the loss of such traffic. Therefore the longer such roads are deprived of this traffic the stronger grows the temptation to get it back by giving the rebate demanded. So, in the end, they give the rebate and then the road over which the large shipper has thrown his freight to the exclusion of other roads, and which road he has used to fight the others must follow suit or lose such freight in turn.

And thus it is that the large shipper gets rebates, is enabled to transport his freight at lower rates than smaller, for the small shipper cannot thus play off one road against another, for the roads do not care so much for his business or materially feel its loss. The result is that the large shipper grows larger and larger.

But if there is an agreement among competing roads for a division of traffic, if there is an agreement that each road shall have a certain percentage of the traffic, that if the large shipper, in an endeavor to beat down freights, gives his business to one road to the exclusion of others, that road shall give back to the others their percentage of such business, the efforts of the large shipper are brought to naught, for the railroads do not care whether he gives his business to one or to all, all the roads getting an arbitrarily fixed share of the traffic regardless of what the shipper may do. And then the roads cannot be effectually threatened, cannot be browbeaten into cutting rates, for they are in position to laugh at the threats. And into such position it was argued the organization of the Joint Traffic Association put the trunk lines, put them in position to maintain uniform rates to all alike, to refuse to discriminate in favor of the large shipper and so refuse to lend themselves to building up monopolies in business. Thus the advantages to the public of such association were pointed out, thus it was argued that this association was not in restraint of trade and that its legality should be affirmed.

But if the Joint Traffic Association puts the trunk lines in position to maintain uniform rates it has not given them the inclination, if it gives railroad managers the power to refuse to discriminate in favor of the large shipper without fear of loss it has not made it to their interest to refuse and they have not, if it was intended to secure the maintenance of uniform rates and prevent the building up of monopolies it has not so operated. The granting of rebates to any shipper is, under the law, illegal and criminal but rebates are granted, and the excuse offered is that if one railroad breaks the law, the others, under free competition, must. But here in the case of the trunk lines, parties to the Joint Traffic Association, we have not free competition, we have conditions, under which we are told that it is possible for the railroads to observe the law, and still they do not do so, they break the law, grant rebates and build up monopolies. Yet we have this association defended before the Supreme Court on the ground that it enables the railroads to observe the law, enables them to refuse to grant rebates, secure an equality of rates to all men, and so promote trade.

The managers of the trunk lines do not observe the law but they break it. It is not because they cannot obey it but because they do not care to, because they find personal profit in ignoring it, that they break the law. And so the creation of a railroad monopoly is no defense against discrimination, no defense against the granting of rebates to the larger shippers, no defense against the use of the railroads for the building up of monopolies in business. Thus it is that the Joint Traffic Association is no defense. It is no defense because though it may put the trunk roads in a strong position, may put them in a position to laugh at the threats of the large shippers, it does not put the managers beyond the temptation of sharing in the rebates, and it is this temptation offered by the large shippers who are indeed set up by such rebates, who have grown to be large shippers because of the enjoyment of such rebates, that induces railroad managers, in the great majority of cases, to grant such rebates. And so no pool, no traffic association will put an end to discrimination. None has, none ever will. The Joint Traffic Association has not and does not. It does not because discrimination does not find its root in free competition, is not explained by the assertion that under free competition where one breaks the law all must, but because it is explained by the fact that railroad managers derive profit from breaking the law.

It is true that the most powerful shipper always has the advantage, for he who has the advantage, who is granted lower freight rates than his competitors, is made thereby the most powerful shipper. Many shippers now powerful were not powerful until they were made powerful by the grant of rebates, were not rich until they were picked out and made rich by railroad managers. And these are the powerful shipping interests which have, we are told, the railroads at their mercy under free competition. If they have it is because railroad managers have sacrificed the interests of their stockholders for private gain and built up monopolies so strong and controlling such vast amounts of freight that the railroads dare not refuse to do their bidding. Thus it was with the most powerful of shippers, the shipper that enjoys greatest privileges, fattens on greatest rebates, the Standard Oil Trust. This shipper as the South Improvement and later the Standard Oil Company, was not powerful until it was made powerful by the grant of rebates which enabled it to undersell its competitors; it was not rich until it was picked out and made rich by railroad managers who profited from its enrichment.

Yet the existence of this trust, the creation of railroad discrimination, and which continues to command rebates is made to do duty as a reason justifying the existence of the Joint Traffic Association. This trust is able, so it was stated before the Supreme Court, to command railroad rates under the competitive system, and thus continue to add to its already great wealth.

The inference is that if it was not for the competitive system, for its ability to play one road off against another it could not command lower rates than its competitors and could not continue to add to its great wealth. And so, it is argued, do away with railroad competition, permit the formation of a railroad trust, so that the threats of the Standard Oil Trust to deprive a road of its business unless such road accedes to the demands of the Oil Trust will be empty and unavailing, and so strike at this oil monopoly. But the Standard Oil commanded rebates in the first instance not because it was powerful, but because railroad managers shared in the profits derived from such rebates; it will continue to command rebates while railroad managers profit by complying with the demand.

Thus railroad managers grant rebates not from necessity growing out of free competition, but from preference, a preference born in the hope of personal gain. And at rebates thus granted from preference no traffic association can or is intended to strike. Organization of such an association may put it in the power of railroad managers to abolish those rebates that are granted from necessity, it will not put an end to those rebates that are granted from preference. It may put an end to the excuse given for breaking the law prohibiting the granting of rebates that when one road breaks the law all the others must; it cannot put an end to the breaking of the law by the granting of rebates from motives of personal gain.

So the Joint Traffic Association is no preventive for discrimination, it cannot be defended on this ground. True, it may be said that if it serves to prevent the granting of rebates from necessity, although it does not strike at the great and most corruptible and injurious mass of rebates, those granted from preference, it tends in a measure toward the establishment of an equality and uniformity of rates and should therefore be upheld for the little good it does and not condemned for the much evil that it fails to remedy. But the plea that railroads must, under free competition, grant rebates from necessity is a perverted one. Because one road breaks the law by the granting of rebates is no valid excuse for competing roads to follow suit. Of course, it is said, that it is a necessity for them to follow suit, that if they did not they would lose traffic, suffer a curtailment of earnings and in the end be wrecked, that to avert bankruptcy they have no alternative but to break the law. But they have an alternative, and that is to aid in enforcing the law. The granting of rebates is a criminal offense for which railroad managers are liable under the law. If then when one road breaks the law the others would aid the government to enforce the law against the guilty instead of becoming trespassers themselves they would make the law respected, make it so dangerous to break that the law would not be broken with impunity and they would thereby avert the so-called necessity of breaking the law because others do. If the railroad managers who make this the excuse for breaking the law strove to enforce the law, others would not and they would not have to break the law in order to keep themselves on a plane of equality with their competitors. By keeping their dishonest brethren up to their plane they themselves would not have to shrink to the plane of law breakers.

But, unfortunately, the railroad managers who profess to regard the granting of rebates as reprehensible, and excuse the granting of such rebates under the plea of necessity, make no effort to enforce the law and so put an end to these evil practices. Such readiness do they show to transgress the law and grant rebates that one must conclude that they have, as a body, no great aversion to becoming law breakers. Indeed the conclusion is unavoidable that there is a temptation to the granting of rebates that attracts them with irresistible force and that temptation is the prospect of personal profit. It is this temptation that leads to the breaking of the law interdicting the granting of rebates, this more than anything else. And this temptation, the organization

of no number of traffic associations in restraint of competition can remove.

And as one great law breaker may be worse, do more injury than several small, so is such an association as the Joint Traffic Association calculated to multiply the evils of rebates not lessen them, for the operation of the trunk lines under common agreement cannot but result in systematizing the granting of rebates in such a way as to turn the shipping of grain and other produce into a few hands and thus effectually establish monopolies in business. Therefore it is that the Joint Traffic Association is not only an association in restraint of competition as admitted by its defenders but an association in restraint of trade and as such is as illegal under the Interstate Commerce Act as its continued existence is injurious to the interests of the general public.

Now we may admit that the pressure of railroad competition is calculated to lead not only to general reductions in freight tariffs, reductions shared in by the whole community, but to special reductions in special cases, reductions made secretly, enjoyed by the few and not by the many, and therefore detrimental to honest industry and injurious to the general weal. So it is that competition has its uses, as well as abuses, and to avoid these abuses, as well as the much broader abuses growing out of rebates granted not under the pressure of competition, but the incentive of private gain, government ownership and operation of our railroads is demanded, demanded so that the temptation of private gain and which leads to the granting of the major part of rebates, may be removed, and so that it may be made impossible for large shippers to command special rates by threatening to take their business from one line and give it to another. Of course, if all lines were operated by the government it would be a matter of absolute indifference as to what line freight was given for transportation, and the playing off of one line against another would be out of the question.

True it is, as we have already said, that if all the roads were organized into a pool or trust the playing off of one road against the others and the securing of rebates thereby would be as impossible as it would be under government ownership, but the formation of such a pool would not put a stop to the granting of rebates under the incentive of private gain, for it would not lead to the removal of such temptation but quite the reverse. Besides the railroad pool is organized to raise rates, to impose the exactions of monopoly, and to subject ourselves to such exactions would be a dear price to pay for freedom from rebates granted under the pressure of competition, for the rebates from which we suffer most and which are most injurious are granted not under the pressure of competition but the temptation of private gain, and freedom from these rebates can not be secured by merely putting an end to competition.

And here it is fitting to remark that railroads are not only amenable to competition between points connected by competing lines of railroad. They are subject to an indirect competition at points reached by no competing road. Their rates to such points must be, in a measure, regulated by the freight rates of other roads. If some roads materially cut their rates so as to enable producers along their lines to reduce the cost of marketing their goods, the other roads must follow suit even though the roads that cut the rates do not run to the same centers of production or even sap the same territory. All roads must in the end reduce their rates under such circumstances as the road that refuses will kill its trade, for if it does not reduce its charges so as to enable those industries located along its lines to market their products as cheaply as the industries located along some other line it will put its own feeding industries under a handicap and confer an advantage upon their competitors which must lead to an increase of the business of such competitors and a diminution of the business done along its own line. Thus it is that two roads running to different productive centers and sapping different territory may be competitors and are in fact where they

run through territory of similar productive capabilities and to the same distributive points.

And so it is that a reduction in rates on one road will often force a reduction of rates on other roads that do not come into direct competition. A delay in making reductions under such indirect competition must stifle industry along the roads hesitating and build up enterprises along the roads making the reductions, thereby causing industry to stagnate in one locality and prosper in another, causing the wrecking of enterprises in one place and an expansion of the profits of industry in another. And so it is argued that a railroad association of broader scope than the ordinary traffic association or pool, an association that could regulate local freight rates and rates to points served by only one road as well as freight rates to points served by two or more roads would be of immense public utility. And so it would if such association would regulate freight rates so that changes in freight tariffs would be made in the same degree and at the same time for all places.

But no private association of railroads can be depended upon to do this. On the contrary, such association would be prone to misuse its power, and do just the reverse. And this is no mere opinion, it is the lesson we have been taught by sad experience. We have had much experience with the private regulation of freight rates to points reached by only one line of road. We have seen rates persistently held up at such points while rates on another road to different, yet none the less competing points, have been materially cut. And why have they been held up? Through ignorance and failure to grasp the results? Not at all, but because of a clear grasp of the inevitable results, a clear conception that such course meant ruin to the industries along the road persistently refusing to reduce rates and a set purpose to refuse to reduce rates that such industries might be wrecked and bought up at wreckage prices by those responsible for holding up the rates. And this accomplished, we have seen rates reduced below the rates on other lines, with the result of instilling life into the properties bought at wreckage prices while the properties on the other lines have suffered depreciation and wrecking in turn.

This has been a too common occurrence in our industrial life and the making of a railroad trust, a trust that would control rates on many roads would aggravate these evil practices. Such trust agreement between railroads would put points served by two or more roads in the same position as those now served by but one. Then nothing would be left to chance in the wrecking of industries on one line and the building up of industries on another, for with freight rates on both lines controlled by the same directing hand there would be no chance of the upsetting of the plans of those who had wrecked the industries along one line and were bent on instilling new life into them by reducing rates below those of other lines, for there would be no danger of such other lines reducing their rates in like manner. In short, such an association would simply put it in the power of the speculative railroad cliques to put rates down and put rates up on such roads as they chose and thereby carry on their nefarious work of gathering wealth by wrecking without the possibility of miscarriage or the chance of loss.

Yet we are told that such concentration of railroad power would be of benefit to the community.

YELLOW JOURNALISM AND STOCK EXCHANGE CRITICS.

SO CALLED "yellow journalism" is bad enough, but the journalism that caters to the whims of Wall street is every whit as bad and it is not right for those who engage in stock exchange journalism to criticise the ways and motives of the "yellow journalist." It is bad enough, surely, for a newspaper

to garble the news and spread out unverified and sensational dispatches in job type, but it is no worse for a newspaper to thus demean itself in order to stimulate sales and increase its receipts than it is for a newspaper to suppress sensational news, belittle it and color it in order to influence the stock markets. The serving of Mammon in one case is as reprehensible as in the other. To garble the news by sprinkling it with sensationalism which is manufactured and spread it out in sensational manner with a view to increasing sales is quite on a par with exercising a censorship over all that is sensational, no matter how well verified, in order that by such suppression and inferential if not direct denial of disquieting but well founded reports the stock markets may be boosted.

When a paper stoops to sensationalism, to spreading false news or exaggerating that which is disquieting with a view to increasing its sales and increasing its profits in a direct way or suppresses such news as is sensational and edits out of dispatches that which is disquieting with a view to influencing the stock market in the interest of some speculative clique and so increasing its profits in an indirect way, it fails of its function and falls short of its obligations as a newspaper. It may be that the editing of the news in the direction of sensationalism by the "yellow journals" aids speculators to depress prices or "bear" the markets as the editing of the news by others so as to suppress anything sensational and likely to depress the stock markets, may aid speculators to push up prices or "bull" the markets. But it is no worse for a newspaper to lend its aid to the bear speculator by editing the news in his interest than it is for a newspaper to lend itself to the bull speculator. To thus impose on their readers for some indirect profit is inexcusable, and it makes little difference whether this indirect profit be paid directly by the speculative group benefited, be derived by the editor or manager or proprietor participating in the gains growing out of his falsifying, coloring or suppressing the news or be received in the shape of patronage of some kind. The degree of fault may be different but the principle is the same in all cases.

With much of this reprehensible newspaper work have we had to put up during the past week. With the newspapers that have spread sensational reports since the destruction of the Maine with a view to swelling their sales and receipts and at the risk of exciting passions difficult to allay, there is much fault to find, but there is even greater fault to be found with the newspapers that would discourage the display of patriotism and make it appear that the nation would rather sacrifice its honor, surrender its rights, than do anything that would cause stocks to depreciate. To thus raise the cry of the worshippers of Mammon that it is better to depreciate patriotism than stock exchange securities, thus raise the cry of the poltroon, is to invite insult and attack, and the papers that stoop to take up this cry do more to endanger the preservation of peace than the papers that by their sensationalism excite angry passions.

In brief, there is as much reason to be ashamed of the stock exchange journalism in the interest of the bull cliques as there is of the "yellow journalism," and the former kind of journalism is more damaging, fraught with greater dangers than the latter. And yet the newspapers that stoop to the wishes of the stock exchanges and edit their columns in the interest of the bull cliques, presume to criticise the "yellow journals." Such journals deserve adverse criticism soundly, but not at such unclean hands. And, finally, when we come to an analysis of the losses charged up against the sensationalism of the "yellow journals," we will find that much of the depreciation in stock exchange values during the last two weeks has other and a sounder basis than sensational news, much of it true, dished up by the unscrupulous yet unjustly reviled "yellow newspapers." Besides, the losses from stock depreciation have fallen largely on the speculative classes, upon mere gamblers who are deserving of little sympathy; and in any event we should never permit mere money losses to

turn us aside from the course of justice and right. To do so is to exalt Mammon and degrade man, admit that we are unworthy of our traditions and high ideals, that the Republic is on the downward track and tottering to an early and not undeserved dissolution. If our administration must feel the pulse of Wall street constantly, weigh every move by its effect on Wall street, and be guided by the pulse of the street, the wishes of the speculators, we are indeed in a sorry plight—a sorry plight from which the common sense, uprightness and exalted patriotism that is inbred in the great body of our people, though wanting in Wall street, can alone extricate us.

As we have said much of the depreciation of stock exchange securities during the past two weeks can not rightly be attributed to the warlike reports so industriously launched by the "yellow journals." And then it is well to remember that war with Spain would occasion no depreciation but rather an enhancement of the true value of securities in general, for it would make increased demands upon our railroads, give an artificial stimulus to industry, and so lead to the swelling of the earnings of railroads and industrial enterprises in general. And this swelling of earnings would certainly swell the real value of such properties, and of course the value of the securities representing such properties.

Of course war and the putting of new issues of government bonds on the markets would have a tendency to drive down present quotations for government bonds. And so also would the withdrawal of money from speculative channels for such investment and the further withdrawal of money from such channels to meet the demands of an increasing trade force the banks in the financial centers to curtail their loans to speculators, which, forcing the liquidation of speculative holdings, would be prone to lead to a wiping out of fictitious values given to securities by stock exchange manipulation. Such fictitious values supported by the abnormally large loans that the New York banks have been able to make to speculators at low rates of interest because of the industrial stagnation and consequent congestion of money in New York must shrink away whenever there comes industrial revival and an increased demand for money in the channels of trade. Whenever this comes the banks in the industrial centers will draw upon New York for their surplus accumulations in the New York banks, accumulations that have gathered and been centered in New York simply because of the inability of the depositing banks to find safe and remunerative employment for it at home because of the stagnation of industry. To respond to this demand the New York banks will curtail their loans to speculators and raise interest rates; this will force an unloading of speculative holdings and this a shrinkage in the fictitious values pumped into securities by the speculative cliques with a view to shunting such securities off on the public at more than their real worth.

Now it is a taste of just this that has been at the bottom of the depreciation in stock exchange values during the last fortnight and not the "yellow journals." In referring to this depreciation *Bradstreet's* said last week: "It is true that there has been a disposition in the daily press to attribute these manifestations to apprehensions connected with the Maine disaster and to the fear of further unfavorable developments in our relations with the Spanish Government. While it is possible that such considerations have had an influence upon financial interests, it can nevertheless be said that the best opinion in financial circles is that the country's requirements for money and the evidence of a rapid reduction in the hitherto superabundant supplies in this market (New York) have been far more effectual in compelling bankers to mark up rates." And *Bradstreet's* further remarks that: "New York bankers have been to a certain extent surprised by the large demand for money at interior points and the growth of the movement of funds from that city to western points, which has been one of the chief features of the past month." Now this demand for money by the western banks and

for use in the industrial channels is a healthy sign, but it means a contraction of loans and raising of interest rates to speculators in New York and consequent falling of stock exchange prices.

There is one circumstance, however, that is likely to prevent any severe contraction of loans or material raising of interest rates at this time for it happens that the New York banks are in position to replenish their resources by drawing upon London. It is currently reported that the New York banks have a credit in London of about \$50,000,000. And there is every reason to put credence in such report. For some time interest rates have ruled higher in London than New York and so it has been profitable for the New York banks to advance money to London which they have done by purchasing and holding, in effect discounting, bills of exchange drawn upon London and representing indebtedness of British merchants on account of purchases of American produce. Of course these bills of exchange are a claim for British gold and the discounting of them by the New York banks is simply a postponement of the presentation of this claim that enables the British bankers to put off shipments of gold. In this way it is believed the New York banks hold a claim on London for \$50,000,000.

That London should have thus run into our debt is not at all surprising when we look at our foreign trade returns for the first seven months of the present fiscal year, which show that we sold during those months \$377,815,561 worth more of merchandise to foreigners than we bought, and \$14,238,046 worth more of silver, or a total favorable balance of \$392,053,607, which has been reduced by net shipments of gold to America by an amount of \$22,374,686. This leaves an apparent net balance in our favor of nearly \$370,000,000, which is much more than enough to meet our average foreign indebtedness incurred on account of interest charges, expenses of Americans abroad, freights earned from us by foreign ship owners, etc. And so it is in no way surprising that our banks and bankers should have accumulated a large credit in London during these months.

Having such a credit in London, all that is needed to bring gold to America in large quantities is a raising of interest rates in New York high enough to make it worth while for the New York banks to draw upon their credits in London, that is, present their bills of exchange for payment, bring the gold to New York and loan it out in the local markets in preference to keeping such money invested in bills of exchange. And it will be worth while for the New York banks to do this whenever interest rates in New York rise above London interest rates with a prospect of remaining so. The slight advance in interest rates last week was enough to cause the shipment of over \$3,000,000 of gold from Europe to New York.

FUSION INCOMPATIBLE WITH POPULISM.

Hon. Wharton Barker, Editor of THE AMERICAN:

Sir:—Your article in the issue of February 19th, "Union under Democratic Banners Impossible," is unanswerable. No man can hold on to the Peoples party with one hand, while with the other hand he holds on to the Democratic party.

I have written many letters, since the appearance of the tripartite addresses, to friends in Virginia, in which I have taken the position that we are debarred absolutely from any union with ring democracy for many reasons.

Chief among them is the condoning, throughout our state, by men in all classes and positions, laymen and preachers, lawyers and doctors, professors and teachers, farmers and laborers, all who call themselves Democrats, of the great wrong not only against morality and honesty, but jeopardizing the very existence of the government itself by debauching the ballot.

It was one of the first declarations of the Peoples party at its birth, not only in Virginia but throughout the South, that our government could not long exist under these frauds, and we pledged ourselves that we would resist them. How then can the Peoples party affiliate with a party that enacts laws which not

only make fraudulent elections possible, but positively invite and encourage them? These are well known facts, not only in Virginia, where men have been tried and convicted of this crime, but throughout the South.

We can never give up this fight for honest elections, for everything we hold dear on earth is bound up with it, yea, even the future honor and uprightness of the lives of our little children depend upon it. This is a sufficient reason, but there is another. The contest that has been raging for some years over free silver coinage, inaugurated primarily by the Farmers' Alliance and made a political issue by the Peoples party, is merely a means to an end. What we really need and must have is the issue of a full legal tender paper money by the government, a money free and untaxed by the user, its volume regulated under the plan laid down in THE AMERICAN, a money that is an honest measure of values both to creditor and debtor, and issued without the intervention of banks.

When the Peoples party ceases to coquette with these recent converts to free silver and boldly and courageously takes its stand upon the constitution that Congress shall regulate the value of money by controlling its volume, then it will have a clear and well-defined road on which to travel and it can take the whole road without confining itself to the middle of it. It will then succeed, just as all other great and noble truths have in the world's history been victorious when the champions of those truths have been bold and courageous and unyielding.

PENRITH, Va.

EDMUND R. COCKE.

POPULISTS, TAKE NOTICE!!!

Let all our readers who subscribe to the grand tenet of Populism, equality of opportunity for all, special privileges to none, all who are resolved that liberty shall not perish from the face of the earth, that the Republic shall not die, who are ready to enroll themselves for resistance to the aggressions of moneyed oligarchy and in defence of human rights, cut out the appended ballot, fill in blanks and return to THE AMERICAN, 119 South Fourth street, Philadelphia.*

Peoples Party Referendum Ballot.

DATE

Believing in the principles of the Peoples Party and favoring independent party action and not having voted on the annexed propositions, I vote as follows:

Propositions.

1. Do you favor a national convention being held, pending the campaign of 1898, for the purpose of promoting the welfare and future policy of the party?

VOTE

YES; or NO.

2. What date is your choice for holding a national convention for the nomination of presidential candidates?

July 4, 1898. May 26, 1899. Feb. 22, 1900.

VOTE

Write on this line your choice of above dates.

My Name is Here voter signs his name in his own hand.

My Post-office is

My County is

My State is

* NOTE.—If the voter desiring to be recorded on the above propositions and so help shape the policy of the Peoples party and the destiny of our Republic, does not wish to disfigure his copy of THE AMERICAN by clipping out the above ballot, he may copy the above ballot on postal card and so have his vote recorded.

To chairmen of county, precinct or township meetings called for the purpose of voting on above propositions, ballots will be sent on application made to N. H. Motsinger, Referendum Committeeman, Shoals, Indiana.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Of Two Patriotisms and Two Policies, Which?

The Interest of America in Sea Power, Present and Future. By CAPTAIN A. T. MAHAN, U. S. N. Boston : Little, Brown & Co. \$2.

The dread spiriting away of a noble man-of-war, with its appalling freight of two hundred and fifty dead seamen, is a stinging blast of the ill wind that must be made to blow the nation instant good. The greater the calamity, the sterner our responsibility to turn it to compensatory account. If it be, as this and other gruesome object lessons indicate, that the modern mailed engine of floating defense is in constant peril of destruction by trumpery factors within and without, the grim discovery shakes public faith in the possibly over-vaunted sea power of nations. We may all be strong on paper and weak on the sea. The very real, however bravely concealed, element of mistrust is itself an enervating influence whose workings defy any effective tracing or checking. In a small navy these hidden evils magnify and multiply in inverse ratio to the fewness of ships. The remedy, safeguard, or whatever comes nearest to reliable insurance against utter collapse during war, seems clear to the unprofessional mind. We must have a stronger navy. Not simply, or necessarily, bigger ships, but more ships. While naval strength remains in its present merely experimental, hardly a probational, stage, it looks as if for once quantity, rather than quality, is the thing that will tell. The settling of these matters must be left to experts and the wisdom at headquarters, but it is high time for the great body of the people to take counsel with those best qualified to give it and, having devised a practicable plan of navy expansion, supply the proper momentum to run it into efficient working order. All this is on the assumption that human nature is likely to stay unregenerate in the mass for a few years longer, and that, meanwhile, a nation claiming to be great had better make quite sure of its first foundation, strength.

If Captain Mahan had not made his mark as a clear and calm thinker and broad-minded interpreter of an unfamiliar branch of history in the works that have become standards in their class, these few collected papers would suffice to stamp their author as possessed of the true statesmanlike grasp of issues pregnant with vast possibilities for the future of the nation. In these eight papers are discussed the outlook for the United States as a world-power. This includes as details the questions of using Hawaii ; of securing the Nicaragua canal ; and the possibilities of a re-union with England. As the latter belongs to a more remote set of contingencies, not to say dreams, than quarrels, fights, and annexations we give precedence to the practical. Captain Mahan is a strong believer in a Greater America. The farthest possible from shallow-pate jingoism he still holds it wise to forecast the future from the standpoint of universal experience. Again and again he insists on the sureness of history repeating itself, on the fallacy that nations can either legislate or preach or pray themselves out of the natural instinct to irritate each other and fall to blows. If the pair of angel nations manage to dwell in the perfect state of bliss which sometimes has been known to outlast the honeymoon heyday, there will pop up some imp of the perverse to blow their peace into pieces with fire-cracker jealousies. Washington and the other founders could not in the nature of things foresee the inevitable perils of our highly strung and complex civilization. We can share their noble ideals while perforce realizing that ours have to be "subdued to what they work in, like the dyer's hand." Quoting the author on the difficulties in the way of those who share his convictions on the duty of patriots to increase the might of the country we find this : "It is a curious feature of our current journalism that it is clear-sighted and prompt to see the unfortunate trammels in which certain of our religious bodies are held, by the cast-iron tenets imposed upon them by a past generation, while at the same time political tenets, similarly ancient, and imposed with a like ignorance of a future which is our present, are invoked freely to forbid this nation from extending its power and necessary enterprise into and beyond the seas, to which on every side it has now attained." He asks where England and her empire would have been if, in the great days of Drake and Raleigh and Cromwell, she had listened to appeals we now hear for a policy of masterly repose. Again he says : "The difficulty is that the United States, as a nation, does not realize or admit as yet that it has any strong interest in the sea ; and that the great majority of our people rest firmly in a belief, deep rooted in the political history of the past, that our ambitions should be limited by the three seas that

wash our Eastern, Western, and Southern coasts. For myself, I believe that this, once a truth, can be considered so no longer with reference even to the present—much less to a future so near that it scarcely needs a prophet's eye to read ; but even if it be but a prejudice, it must be removed before a further step can be taken." Whether Captain Mahan gains acceptance as a statesman or not, there will be few disposed to question his authority as an expert in the measures to be adopted if his warnings and counsels prevail.

The two vital points of action, if any is ever to be taken in the premises, are those of the Isthmus and Hawaii, and the time is now. "Militarily speaking," he contends, "and having reference to European complications only, the piercing of the Isthmus is nothing but a disaster to the United States in the present state of her military and naval preparation. . . . Despite a certain great original superiority conferred by our geographical nearness and immense resources—due, in other words, to our natural advantages and not to our intelligent preparations—the United States is woefully unready, not only in fact but in purpose, to assert in the Caribbean and Central America a weight of influence proportioned to the extent of her interests." Capt. Mahan goes into illustrative detail to show "that which I deplore, and which is a sober, just and reasonable cause of deep national concern, is that the nation neither has nor cares to have its sea frontier so defended and its navy of such power as shall suffice with the advantages of our position to weigh seriously when inevitable discussions arise." This was written seven years ago, and these anticipations have come sufficiently true to justify the writer's contention.

In no alarmist spirit, but as a shrewd man of the world, anxious to keep on the safe, which is the strong side, he reminds us that war is ever in the air, and rumors of war which are the seeds of war. All around us is strife, nation struggling against nation, diplomatic wars, tariff wars, trade wars. These thirty years we have stayed in the background of our own volition, while the oceans have been mapped into countless watery highroads for the merchant ships of other nations. When the Isthmus is pierced, all will be changed. All the world will use the new canal and crowd the Caribbean sea. The great powers will beg, buy, or steal a foot of earth each to protect their interests around the new centre of trade and political importance. What does Capt. Mahan advise to secure our controlling influence in our own sphere? Three things ; more harbor protection ; more fighting ships ; and, thirdly, "it should be an inviolable resolution of our national policy that no foreign state should henceforth acquire a coaling position within three thousand miles of San Francisco, a distance which includes the Hawaiian and Galapagos Islands and the coast of Central America. For fuel is the life of modern naval war ; it is the food of the ship, without it the modern monsters of the deep die of inanition." In another writing Capt. Mahan suggests a startling, if remote, reason for timely action. Many philosophical military authorities in Europe and here, familiar with the East, "look with apprehension toward the day when the vast mass of China, now inert, may yield to one of those impulses which have in past ages buried civilization under a wave of barbaric invasion." She may as probably overflow eastwards as west, in which case everything would depend on the firm occupation of the Hawaiian Islands by a great, civilized, maritime power. We are the predestined guardians of civilization in this hemisphere. The question is—shall we qualify for the position? Again he sounds his counterblast against "the popular catchword—a navy for defense only." He says : "when, if ever, people recognize that we have three seabards, that the communication by water of one of them with the other two will depend in a not remote future upon a strategic position hundreds of miles distant from our nearest port, the mouth of the Mississippi, they will see also that the word 'defense,' already too narrowly understood, has its application at points far away from our own coast." And so on through these weighty pages rings the note of muscular patriotism, calmly but powerfully argued and illustrated from the author's store of widely gathered knowledge. His studiedly unimpassioned pages rivet attention as much by their intellectual force as by his admirable and lucid style, which has the charm of eloquent common sense.

When he leaves his province of naval technics and national defence for that of the seer, Captain Mahan, like Jack ashore, lays himself open to landlubber criticism on level terms. His article, "A Twentieth Century Outlook," is an impressive contribution to the best thought on the larger problems of our time. Its wide and deep range gives unusual solidity to the body of fact and inference welded into this not ignobly pessimistic fore-

Wanamaker's.

New "QUAKER CITY BOND" Writing Papers is a new claimant for your favor. It is a smooth, rough looking paper, with pleasant writing surface. White, blue; two sizes. Sold only this way:—one-fourth ream packages, with 100 envelopes to match, for 50c.

"The Prince" is another new comer; blue, kid finish, square.

Then "Millitaire," a strikingly handsome paper in an odd soldier gray.

"Royal Vellum" and "London Club Vellum" are here in the new square sizes.

Crests and monograms and other die stamping have very special attention. Juniper street side.

Novels at 5c. HANDY place to buy magazine or paper bound book, as you're hurrying to trains—the new counter at Juniper and Market street corner.

To-day it is piled with well-printed paper-bound novels at five cents each.

The authors whose works are represented—and there are a full hundred titles—are

Charles Garvice	Florence Warden
The Duchess	Mrs. Alexander
W. Clark Russell	Walter Besant
H. Rider Haggard	W. E. Norris
Hugh Conway	J. M. Barrie

Charlotte M. Braeme
Robt. Louis Stevenson
John Strange Winter.

BOOK NEWS for March is ready—frontispiece portrait of Hezekiah Butterworth, who furnishes the short story of the month—"The Chamber in the Chimney."

Book News is replete with all its usual good features, 5c.

JOHN WANAMAKER.



THE Munson Typewriter

Is the Best Writing Machine.



HIGHEST GRADE STANDARD OF EXCELLENCE.
Controlled by no Trust or Combine.

The most durable typewriter in existence.
Contains more good features than any other one Typewriter.

Address for Particulars,

The Munson Typewriter Co.

Manufacturers

240-244 West Lake Street
Chicago, Ill.

cast of the future. Surveying the world of man and the trend of things, we note how the author recurs at shortening intervals to his dominant cry of alarm. The days are evil; be it Providence, or be it blind fate, we have ever drifted, are still drifting, and are destined long to drift into race rivalries, class jealousies, social clashings, all of which make for permanent unrest, and this, in its turn, makes for the expansion of forces and elbow-room. Nothing short of ever-renewed and increased striking power can insure the holding of what room and prosperity and measure of peace we have got. Is it wise, then, to make friends with our strongest neighbors? Are old neighbors necessarily friends? There is a piping voice that sings the praise and brotherly kindness of good John Bull; shall we hint that part of his empire would make a logical addition to our territories? Captain Mahan's answer is rather that of the sentimental than the statesman, though its core is patriotism as he conceives it from his world-wide, centuries-sweeping point of view. Some day, somehow, he sees the new union, with the flag of race-patriotism waving overhead. The thing, says he, cannot be forced; the more it is pushed the further is its recoil. An Anglo-American alliance, even of navies only, is too ticklish a scheme to be workable, if the consent of the nation on this side is counted as an essential. This unconcealable stumbling block irritates the Captain, fresh as he was when he penned this discourse from the shower of honors poured on his worthy head by Oxford and Cambridge, whose D. C. L. and LL. D. appear on the title page without mention of their sources. "That there is lukewarm response in the United States (to the friendly disposition of the English), is due to that narrow conception which grew up with the middle of the century . . . which would turn all eyes inward, and see no duty save to ourselves. How shall two walk together except they be agreed? How shall there be true sympathy between a nation whose political activities are worldwide, and one that eats out its heart in merely internal political strife?" If Capt. Mahan the American were set to reply to this speech by Capt. Mahan the cosmopolitan, how grandly he would array the second and third of these sentences as annihilating the body and soul of the first. We get a touch of the thrill he would stir by demanding some glimpse at the names and the status of the Americans who should hint that the spirit of Independence was or is "narrow," and that present-day patriotism, being our very own, is only "lukewarm" alongside cosmopolitan patriotism. How, indeed, can two such conceptions of devotion to our country walk together in agreement? There must be a core of logic in any utterance of Capt. Mahan's, but it may have oozed out in the tearful gush of the third sentence, that plaintive query as to the cannibalistic affection Uncle Sam is displaying for his lukewarm heart. Change the terms and we see he is simply asking how we can expect an old and prosperous merchant to go into ecstacies over the proposal of a big department store from a distant city to build next door and gobble him up by underselling and overbearing? Capt. Mahan begins all right by asking how "true sympathy" can exist in the former's bosom, and then his logic spills out in the implication that the merchant is "narrow" in valuing the business that has made him prosperous more than he values the lovely opportunity offered him to help his rival. For no one knows better than Capt. Mahan that once an alliance was effected between compact America and sprawly Britain, Uncle Sam would find he had let himself in for fifty brother-duty fights for the gain and glory of John Bull, to one the latter would ever have to fight for him. Sentiment is one thing—and a noble thing—and sentimentality is another and a trashy thing, as Capt. Mahan somewhere acknowledges. A proposal, were it seriously made, on these lines would subject the sentiment of patriotism to the sentimentalism of something distantly related to what used to be bluntly called high treason. But no such proposal is made, or is it likely to be made in our generation. Friendship is one of heaven's chief blessings, a comfort and a giver of strength, yet the wise do well not to see their friends too often, nor know them too intimately, as in this direction lies danger. Race patriotism, the glories of the motherland and the English tongue, are legitimate grounds for great handshakings across the sea, though spokesmen on both shores should always conclude with a form of devout thanks to the Maker of that beneficent barrier of cold water. The patriotism which began and which will complete the towering edifice of American independence neither was nor is lukewarm nor narrow. On the same true lines it will grow broad and high, till it looks down on lesser nations' growth and on mighty empires' decay, but with no lessening of its old sympathy with all good peoples whose blood and muscle have helped in its building. If peoples were governments and sympathy swayed

RUNNING EARS.

The Result of Chronic Catarrh of the Middle Ear.

Mr. W. Brigham, Pilot Knob, Wis., writes to Dr. Hartman as follows: "Last April we commenced doctoring my son Edgar for chronic otitis, running of the ears. He is now about fifteen years old and had been troubled with it since he was two years old. It became very bad and ran constantly. He began to get discouraged himself and we had little hopes of his recovery, when I wrote to you. But we were persistent in carrying out the prescription that you sent me. It has now been about seven months since there has been any discharge. Wax has formed in the ear and he appears perfectly well. I am very much pleased with your remedy." Chronic otitis is catarrh of the ears. If allowed to run without proper treatment it results in total deafness. Pe-ru-na cures catarrh wherever located.



Dr. Hartman has lately published in book form a series of lectures on the different phases of catarrh. It is called "Winter Catarrh," and will be sent free to any address by the Pe-ru-na Drug Manufacturing Company, Columbus, Ohio.



No necessity for a bad or rough complexion.
Milk Weed Cream is the natural Skin Food. It removes Blackheads, Freckles, Tan, Pimples, Wrinkles. Is fragrant and soothing. Send 50c. for a full size jar (if your druggist hasn't it) and get ten times its cost in pleasure and satisfaction. Send stamp for free sample.

FREDERICK F. INGRAM & CO.,
49 Tenth Street, DETROIT, MICH.



the sceptre, a great day it would be for race-patriotism and a mighty poor one for navies and doctors of Christian civilization who want inoculation by big guns. Till then good old-fashioned patriotism, such as our forefathers planted and nourished must always, like charity, begin at home, and if a new revised version calls it love, then patriotism, which is love enlarged and intensified, must ever centre in home and kindred. In his powerful plea for the duty of giving to these a protection so strong that kind neighbors shall be weak in comparison, Capt. Mahan is exalting this old-fashioned American patriotism in spite of his other self.

**

A Fighting Parson's Fiction-framed Picture of Washington.

For Love of Country. A Story of Land and Sea in the Days of the Revolution. By CYRUS TOWNSEND BRADY, Archdeacon of Pennsylvania. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.25.

A clerical novelist is by no means a rare phenomenon, but those who extract a primitive brew of fun from the delusion that Philadelphia is slow, because she moves with stately sureness, have now got a nut to crack, and it is not a chestnut. The three best historical romances of the decade, dealing with the youth of the American nation, are those written by three distinguished citizens of Philadelphia, and published within a few weeks of each other. The first in point of time, and doubtless of literary merit, is "Hugh Wynne," by an eminent physician, Dr. Weir Mitchell; the second is "The Latimers," by an eminent Presbyterian divine, the Rev. Dr. McCook, and the third, the present volume, by the P. E. Archdeacon of Pennsylvania, worthily sustains the literary reputation of his Church. More than this, each of them has wrought under the inspiration of strong love of country, and not from the motives of the professional story-teller. When a busy man makes time to do some worthy work other than that by which he lives it is safe to presume that he is moved by ardor born of special knowledge or disinterested zeal for good, and probably by both. The two earlier romances, already noticed in these pages, bore out this expectation. So does this one, and in an independent direction. Archdeacon Brady was clearly foreordained to belong to the church militant, first as a trained officer in that department of its secular service known to muscular Christianity as the United States Navy, and afterwards he became an officer, as we see, in its more tranquil enclosure—the sheep-fold. This, of course, suggests the pen, and hence our small surprise that the surplus eloquence of our divines should overflow into these lay sermons, so much more entertaining to the pew-folk than the average pulpit prosings. The author takes the grave risks of firing off a Preface as nonchalantly as if it were no more than a blank cartridge from a gun. In it he anticipates his readers' smothered growl that some of the yarns "draw too heavily upon his credulity." New and welcome, beyond all praise, is this sign of the pulpit's long delayed willingness to obey its own injunction to "confess your sins one to another," even unto the lowly plate enricher. But perhaps the gracious concession is only the voice of the romancing Esau though the pen is that of reverend Jacob. Anyway, as it regards this book, it is comforting to be assured that the sea fights so spiritedly described "really happened," and until now have not been adequately recorded in the histories. Then again, the author very properly vouches for the faithfulness of his portrayal of Washington. Certain writers "are doing much to destroy the popular canonization which made of the man a saint. In defence of my characterization of him I am able to say that the incidents and anecdotes and most of the conversations in which he appears are absolutely historical." We have given to these important points the space which might have been filled with a sketch of the story, but it should better serve the ends of the book to have it known that the bulk of it is solid fact, with a minimum of myth. Archdeacon Brady has done thoroughly good literary work and true patriotic service in writing it. His picture of the campaigns of Trenton and Princeton will gain, and not suffer, by comparison with any of the sort before the public, and if his speech is as graphic as his pen there is hope for at least one pulpit winning back some of the lost glories.

**

Tyranny of Grammatical Rules.

Functuation, Hyphenation, Capitalization and Spelling. By F. HORACE TRALL. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

When a beginning is once made in the tinkering and silver-plating of our poor old ill-used language, farewell to peace. It is fairly hale and hearty, considering its age, but doctors have insistently pronounced it to be in a very sick and doddering

state. They have not only found it a very profitable patient for their learned selves, but in their train have followed a whole regiment of the aforesaid tinkers and tailors and bellows-menders, singularly gifted with the knack of leaving two new holes for each one they patch up. The dictionary doctors are bad enough to stand, but these smaller fry bid fair to worry their patient into lunacy. No wonder we speak shocking bad English if the writers of this sort of English-bewitched are the models we should imitate. If the doctrine of free will has a shred of clothes

ENDURING ALWAYS

THE

PENN MUTUAL LIFE

INSURANCE COMPANY



The Ancient and Modern Symbols of STABILITY

The best forms of modern life insurance furnished by members to members at cost. A mutual organization having 60,000 members; assets over \$31,000,000; surplus over \$3,500,000. Address for publications including sample policies. We pay postage.

921-3-5 Chestnut St., Philadelphia

RAYMOND & WHITCOMB'S TOURS.

ALL TRAVELING EXPENSES INCLUDED.

Parties of limited numbers will leave New York on dates named below for a series of High Class Tours through

EUROPE.

April 16, for Italy, Austria-Hungary, Germany Switzerland, the Rhine, Holland, Belgium, France and England. May 31, joining the foregoing in Germany. May 31, for England, Norway (its Fjords and the land of the Midnight Sun), Sweden, Denmark, Germany and France. May 31, for England, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Northern Italy, Switzerland and France. July 2, for France, Northern Italy, Switzerland, the Rhine, Holland, Belgium and England.

A party (also of limited size) will leave Philadelphia August 2d or 23d for a grand Tour

AROUND THE WORLD.

Visit will be made to Hawaii, Japan, China, the Straits Settlements, Ceylon, India, Egypt, the Holy Land, Turkey, Greece, Italy, etc. The August 2d party will have three weeks in Hawaii. Send for illustrated descriptive circulars designating whether Europe or "Around the World" is desired.

RAYMOND & WHITCOMB,
1005 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.
(Mutual Life Ins. Building.)

CALIFORNIA**3 IN THREE DAYS 3****SUNSET IRON MOUNTAIN LIMITED ROUTE.**

From CHICAGO and ST. LOUIS through Little Rock, Texarkana, Dallas, Ft. Worth and EL PASO to LOS ANGELES.

Special Features offered via the True Southern Route, consist of the Sunset Limited—composite car, with barber shop, bathroom, and gentlemen's buffet, lounging and smoking compartment; ladies' parlor car, with private sleeping compartments and assembly hall; dining car—meals served à la carte, and two or more double drawing room sleepers; the train is lighted throughout with Pintach gas, and the composite and parlor cars are furnished with libraries and current literature. This elegantly equipped train runs from Chicago and St. Louis through without change.

EXCURSION TICKETS TO

CITY OF MEXICO.
HOT SPRINGS, ARKANSAS
America's Greatest Health Resort.

For further information apply to nearest ticket agent, or H. C. TOWNSEND, Gen'l Pass. and Ticket Agt., St. Louis, Mo., or WM. R. HOYT, Gen'l Eastern Pass. Agt., 391 Broadway, New York.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD
Runs Two Solid Ventilated Trains Daily

DIAMOND NIGHT SPECIAL TRAIN
DAYLIGHT SPECIAL TRAIN

between Chicago and St. Louis.
Free Reclining Chair Cars, Pullman Buffet Parlor Cars, Pullman Buffet Open and Compartment Sleeping Cars. See that your ticket between Chicago and St. Louis reads via Illinois Central Railroad. It can be obtained of your local ticket agent.
A. H. HANSON, G. P. A., Ill. Cent. R. R., Chicago, Ill.



Send for STAMP SELECTION, on approval at 50 per cent. com. Sure to please. 50 diff. U. S., 25c. 75 diff., \$1. 100 diff. Foreign, 8c. 125 Canada, etc., 15c. Price List Free!

F. W. MILLER, 904 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

left on its back and if liberty is not a mockery and a snare, there is still some chance of asserting our right to remain masters of our common mother-tongue instead of sinking to be its slaves. Of all abhorrent despotsisms that of grammar is the least respectable. It has just one solitary saving virtue, it has been the support of a numerous and well-meaning tribe who long to domineer over us in some way and so seek to rule our speech fashions, failing the power to guide our thoughts or the natural expression of them. Fashion-setters have their use in the scheme of the universe, we dare not doubt it, and in the Judgment Day the inventor of a simpler shoe-string or a fussier doctrine of the semi-colon will surely get their due rewards, which, probably, will radically differ.

For those who fancy that natural speech, which is the only elegant and strong speech, is to be acquired only by mechanical methods, this little book of how-to-do-it and know-it-all will be a great blessing. Its student will be awed by its array of "principles," "laws," "rules," in the high science of "rhetorical pointing," and if he gains anything by his labor it will be a depressing conviction of sin in that hitherto he has not known, "formally anything about punctuation." He will be cheered in a melancholy way by discovering that the ordained apostles of the new dispensation of Comma-ites indulge in wicked slangings of each other for heretical and "nonsensical assertions."

Under pretence of simplifying these deep doctrines we are allured into a hopeless maze over the orthodox way to spell. Many pages are filled with rival spellings in competing dictionaries; the grand result leaves us free to pay our money and take our choice. Much the same go-as-you-please conclusion ends the decree upon dropping the old style k from music. But don't we stick it into our delightful home-made word "panicky"? We are ordered never to put a second p in "worshipping" and "gossiping" as effete Britishers do, but it is the correct fashion to keep on writing "shipping" and "sipping." Only eleven lines are given to the u in "honour," etc., and the law is rather feebly proclaimed in the summary, "undoubtedly the American way is better than the other, historically as well as economically." But if the economy of dropping a letter is the better way, why not drop the i in "subtile," as the English do, seeing it is pronounced subtle. Instructors who set up to be legislators of the cramping stamp would themselves tread in "the better way" if they ceased to worry over other folks' peccadilloes, and turn their great minds to the weeding out of their own atrocities of speech, such as these, "off of it," page 121, and "such spelling is rather exceptional than *rutable*," page 177. The only justification for dwelling on dry husk books of this class is that they show the worthlessness of any attempt to make really telling speech, spoken or written, out of cut and dried artificial forms. Let the student steep his wits in the great writers of pure English of all the centuries, and limit his conversation as much as possible to those who speak the English of those who know it best in books and in the best usage of the day, polished, simple and racy. All the rest, such as details of accent, breathing and punctuation pauses, and so-called elocution, can safely be left to common sense. If it does not happen to be in stock, a long, solitary, country walk and a good think might be better than a machine book.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

THE QUEEREST MAN ALIVE and Other Stories. By George H. Hepworth. Pp. 271. New York: R. F. Fenno & Co. \$1.25.

PEBBLES FROM THE PATH OF A PILGRIM. By Mrs. H. L. Hastings. Pp. 318. Boston: H. L. Hastings. 50 cents.

THE SCARLET VEINED and Other Poems. By Lucy Cleveland. Pp. 135. New York: A. D. F. Randolph Company.

EMERSON AND OTHER ESSAYS. By John J. Chapman. Pp. 247. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.25.

YOUNG BLOOD. By E. W. Hornung. Pp. 330. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.25.

Florida—Last Tour of the Season via Pennsylvania Railroad.

The last of the popular Pennsylvania Railroad personally-conducted tours to Jacksonville will leave New York and Philadelphia by special train of Pullman palace cars on Tuesday, March 8.

Round-trip tickets, valid to return on regular trains until May 31, 1898, and including railway transportation in each

direction, and Pullman accommodations (one berth) and meals on special train going, will be sold at the following rates: New York, \$50.00; Philadelphia, \$48.00; Canandaigua, \$52.85; Erie, \$54.85; Wilkesbarre, \$50.35; Pittsburg, \$53.00; and at proportionate rates from other points.

For tickets, itineraries and full information apply to ticket agents; Tourist Agent, 1196 Broadway, New York; Thomas Purdy, Passenger Agent Long Branch District, 789 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.; Thos. E. Watt, Passenger Agent Western District, Pittsburg, Pa.; or address Geo. W. Boyd, Assistant General Passenger Agent, Broad Street Station, Philadelphia.—Advt.



SIBERIAN. Highest grade, embodying every late improvement of value, 1½ inch imported tubing, flush joints, improved two-piece cranks, arch crown, large detachable sprockets, handsomest finish and decorations, Morgan & Wright, quick repair tires, single or double tube, high grade equipment. Special price on sample..... \$29.00.

COSSACK. A splendid machine, equal to any for service and easy running. Best 1½ inch seamless tubing, two piece cranks, arch crown, detachable sprockets, finely finished and decorated, Morgan & Wright, quick repair tires, single or double tube, high grade equipment. Our special sample price..... \$24.00.

KLONDIKE. Best medium grade for 1898. 1½ inch tubing, striped and decorated, arch crown, dust-proof bearings, ball retainers, best Indiana or New Brunswick tires, standard equipment. Special price on sample..... \$19.00.

NOTE. Choice of Color, Style, Height of Frame, Gear, etc. Fully Guaranteed.

You will be surprised at the appearance and quality of these wheels. Don't wait, order now while this offer is open. Prices will be much higher soon. You can make Big Money as our Agent, selling for us. We give our agents choice of cash, the free use of a sample wheel, or gift of a wheel, according to work done.

Do You Want Cheap Wheels?

We have numbers of 1896 and 1897 model wheels of various makes and styles, some a little shop-worn, but all new..... \$12.00 to \$16.00.

Wheels Slightly Used, Modern Types, - - \$8.00 to \$12.00.

Our business and reputation are known throughout the country. References, any of the express companies, or any bank in Chicago. Art Catalogue free. Secure agency at once.

The J. L. Mead Cycle Co., - Chicago.

SILVER SOUVENIR COINS OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA

Will You Aid the Cause?

The Silver Souvenir is a beautiful lasting memento of your aid to the cause of Liberty.

The Price of the Souvenir is One Dollar

plus the following forwarding scale to all parts of the United States:—one 10c., two 12c., three 14c., four 16c., five 18c., six 20c., seven 22c., eight 24c., and nine to twenty 25c. extra for expressage.

All orders for twenty or more sent expressage prepaid.

This coin weighs 348 grains of silver, .900 fine.

Upon the successful termination of the war and the establishment of a free and republican government in Cuba these souvenirs will be redeemed by the Cuban Republic for One Dollar each.

All orders must be accompanied by check, P. O. money order, express money order or cash.

Address all orders to

**JOSE ZAYAS, Commissioner,
FINANCIAL BUREAU, Room I. 56 New St., New York.**